

## **Soil and Water Conservation Commission Cost Share Committee**

**August 30, 2012: 8:30am**

<https://denr.ncgovconnect.com/cscommittee/>

[\(919\)250-4221](tel:(919)250-4221)

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Brian Lannon, Rob Baldwin, Jennie Hauser, Julie Henshaw, Davis Ferguson, Kelly Ibrahim, Vicky Porter, Brian Chatham, Charles Bass, David Williams

### **Agenda**

#### **Information item**

1. Commission action: adoption of policy addressing supplemental allocations of cost share financial assistance

#### **Action items**

1. Approval of June meeting minutes  
The June meeting minutes were approved by consensus.
2. Condensing program manuals into one document  
Multiple ways of pursuing revisions:
  - Ask for committee to have delegated authority for policies where only a name change is required
  - Complete the entire manual and bring everything to the SWCC at one time for action
    - Do not present policies with name changes as separate items (see bullet above).
  - Prepare an update for the September SWCC meeting, with request for action item for committee to have delegated authority for policies where only a name change is required
3. Draft policy revisions for consideration
  - a. Introducing new or revised BMPs to a cost share program
  - b. Cost share program contracts on government-owned property
  - c. Prohibition of post-approval of contracts
    - i. The SWCC could formally set aside this policy for a specific funding source – ex. drought response program. SWCC can revise any policies or set them aside at anytime.
  - d. Supervisor involvement in spot checks for cost share program contracts
  - e. Program year due dates  
Consider rule change from 1<sup>st</sup> Wed in June to June 1<sup>st</sup> for deadline date (02 NCAC 59D .0103, 02 NCAC 59H .0103)

4. Review of technical assistance allocation parameters

Items to consider in revisions:

- Lowering the cap per employee (set a minimum amount or funding threshold per employee)
- Have a tiered approach for increases, subject to availability of funding
  - Creating the expectation that if skills increase, there will be funding available to support the increase
  - Creating the expectation that local government can meet the match
  - What will happen to people who are already at the cap and would receive a lower annual amount moving to a new system?
- Tying allocations to performance – both using available funding
- Tying allocations to difficulty of practices completed in each year or JAA obtained
- Tier for certified conservation planner or X number of JAA for vegetative practices and engineering practices
- Two year rule making process will provide time for input and working with local governments on payment changes

Current Rule: [02 NCAC 59D .0106 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FUNDS](#)

Have a set period of time to review: minimum of 45 days, make information available for Fall Area Meetings

**Questions for district survey:**

- Do you think that the current TA allocation methodology results in an equitable distribution of limited funds?
- Should the commission continue to place priority of funding a minimum of one district employee per district?
- Should technical assistance funding be linked to district cost share performance?
  - Dollars encumbered to contracts
  - Dollars spent on contracts
  - Technical difficulty of practices
  - Meeting the priorities specified in the district strategy plan
- Should TA funding be linked to demonstrated technical capabilities (ex. JAA, technical specialist designation, county goals, etc)?
- Would your district support a tiered funding approach for technical assistance based on set criteria?
- Include space for suggestions
- Would someone in your district (supervisors and staff) be willing to review drafts of revisions to the TA rule?
  - Email address

5. Set next meeting date

**Monday, October 8<sup>th</sup>: 8:30am**

TA items, FA allocation, survey results

\*Recommend moving the SWCC meeting to Nov. 14<sup>th</sup>, work session on Nov. 13<sup>th</sup>